

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 9, 1999

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Gary Brown, Tempe, Chairman
*Victor Mendez, ADOT
Debbie Kohn for William Bates, Avondale
Patrice Kraus, Chandler
*Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills
Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Jim Book for Ken Martin, Glendale
Doug Sanders, Goodyear
*Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park

Chris Plumb for Tom Buick, Maricopa County
Jeff Martin, Mesa
David Moody, Peoria
Tom Callow, Phoenix
*Dick Schaner, Queen Creek
Ken Driggs, RPTA
Steve Hogan, Scottsdale
Bill Parrish, Surprise

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

Regional Bicycle Task Force: Patrick
McDermott, Chandler
*Street Committee: Ron Krosting, Mesa
Pedestrian Working Group: Steve Hancock for
Mike Branham, Surprise

*Intermodal Management System Working
Group: Dave Berry, Swift Transportation
Company
Telecommunication Working Group: Debbie
Kohn, Avondale

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dan Cook, Chandler
Dawn Coomer, MAG
John Farry, MAG
Terry Johnson, MAG
Sarath Joshua, MAG
Kelly Taft, MAG
Rita Walton, MAG
Paul Ward, MAG
Tom Buick, MCDOT

Don Herp, Phoenix
Lisa Takata, Phoenix
Bob Antila, RPTA
Bryan Jungwirth, RPTA
Peggy Carpenter, Scottsdale
E.M. Al DeShazo, Surprise
Harvey Friedson, Tempe
John Osgood, Tempe

1. Call to Order

Chairman Gary Brown called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

2. Programming of Projects for MAG Federal Funding FY 1999-2004

Terry Johnson provided an overview of this agenda item. Two initial working programs were created for committee discussion: a formula option and a staff option. The formula option literally applied guidance given by the committee at the January 26th meeting. The staff option modified the guidance somewhat to incorporate other factors. Paul Ward provided additional description of the option, and Jeff Martin requested discussion of the matching rates before additional discussion of this item.

4. Further Considerations on Matching Rates for MAG Federal Funds

On January 26, 1999, the TRC approved an increment matching rate for MAG federally funded projects as follows: for up to \$1 million - 5.7 percent; for \$1-\$2 million - 20 percent; for \$2-\$3 million - 25 percent; for \$3-\$4 million - 30 percent; and over \$4 million - 35 percent.

The Chairman of the MAG Management Committee requested that this item be further addressed by the TRC. With the development of the 2000-2004 Transportation Improvement Program underway, the issue of when the matching rates would first be applied needs to be discussed. It is anticipated that results would be reported to the Management Committee on February 10, 1999.

Jeff Martin asked about the reason for additional discussion of this concept. Gary Brown noted that the Regional Council would vote on accepting the TIP in March, and that tomorrow's Management Committee meeting did not preclude voting on revised matching rates at the March Regional Council meeting. Paul Ward added that the match rates could be easily changed with the assistance of the computer. Jeff suggested forwarding only three years of projects, leaving the matching rates alone for this year and next year, but have the rates changed for the remaining four years. Gary added that additional funds may be available, and agreed with submitting only three years worth of projects.

Tom Callow noted that many projects require a long time to design, and three years may be insufficient lead time for these types of projects. Chris Plumb agreed with Tom, and added that some projects require two to three years for design. Patrice Kraus said that the idea of increasing the match rate shows local commitment and gives the opportunity to fund additional projects. She asked for additional discussion of problems with the increasing match rate.

Tom noted that the match rate was decided after projects were submitted, and did not give jurisdictions the ability to determine whether to submit the higher cost projects. Patrice noted that projects could be pulled at the jurisdiction's request. Gary asked when the new match rates should apply. Jeff noted that jurisdictions may need to reconsider their list of projects, and that perhaps the standard should be applied in FY 2000. The goal is to give smaller jurisdictions additional funds for projects.

The committee discussed the idea. The definition of FY 2000 was clarified to mean projects submitted for funding in FY 2001. Jim Book asked what would happen if the Regional Council did not approve the concept. Jeff suggested that a one-year list of projects be recommend at the current match rate, and that additional obligation authority be dealt with at another time. Debbie Kohn asked about the allocation, and Jeff noted that the project priorities needed to be discussed. Patrice agreed, and Tami Ryall added that several small communities did not have projects listed in the staff option.

Ken Driggs suggested exempting bike and pedestrian projects from the higher match requirement, and the committee discussed this. Jeff suggested focusing on when the match should be implemented. Patrice Kraus moved to apply the new incremental match rates to new projects after the FY 2000 program year. New match rates would not apply to projects included in the 1999-2003 TIP or MAG, RPTA or ADOT projects. Jeff Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed with Glendale, Maricopa County, Phoenix, Scottsdale and Tempe voting against the motion.

2. Programming of Projects for MAG Federal Funding FY 1999-2004

Discussion of this item continued with the staff recommendation. Ken Driggs suggested that the staff recommendation be used as a starting point, and that the new match apply to all projects except bike and pedestrian projects. Bill Parrish noted that dust stabilization projects in the West Valley were recommended for acceleration by the Street Committee. He added that these projects could be done in FY 1999, and requested that they be added to the staff option. Chris Plumb agreed with Bill. Terry Johnson explained that these projects were ranked low by the Street Committee even though they could have been advanced. Bill added that the three projects total \$300,000. Debbie Kohn mentioned that the MAGTAG committee had no opportunity to review the staff recommendation, and suggested that the modal chairs meet with their committees before the next TRC meeting. Tami added that there was a problem with joining the bicycle and pedestrian projects, and that the modal committee's rankings were not used. Terry Johnson noted that the bicycle and pedestrian committee rankings were used by combining the two rankings. The committee continued to discuss various aspects of the staff option.

Ken Driggs suggested incorporating the three dust stabilization projects for Surprise, and not apply the new matching rates to bike and pedestrian projects. The committee generally agreed to incorporating the Surprise projects, but not to different match rates for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Patrice noted that projects already in the program are exempt from the higher match rates. Jeff asked how RPTA projects were divided and how the TRC guidance was incorporated into the staff option. Terry noted that ITS Dial-a-Ride projects slightly decreased the amount to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Patrice asked why ITS transit projects came from ITS rather than transit. Terry explained that there were a limited number of pedestrian projects, and so bike and pedestrian projects were combined which resulted in more money for bicycle projects. Tami noted that the modal allocation suggested at the last TRC was for all transit projects, including ITS. Patrice agreed, adding that streets didn't get enough funds this year.

Debbie again noted that the modal committees needed to review the staff option. Tom Callow asked for clarification of the telecommunications projects, and Debbie responded. Patrice asked for the status of the teleconferencing pilot programs, and Debbie responded. Gary summarized by noting that the Surprise projects should be included, and asked for additional guidance for staff. Ken suggested using the staff option as a baseline for transit since it offered a more balanced approach. Jeff agreed, and noted that the ITS and bicycle/pedestrian issue still needed to be addressed. Gary asked when the modal committees needed to meet and when staff needed their additional input. Terry responded that input was needed by February 18th. Jeff added that the Management Committee needed an understanding of why the match rate was done: to show local commitment and to allow more projects for smaller communities. Gary summarized the guidance for staff. The Surprise projects should be included, comments from the modal committees were needed by February 18th, and a three year program should be developed two ways: using the old match rates and with the new match rates.

3. Early Information on 1999 Update of the MAG Long Range Transportation Plan

John Farry provided a brief overview of changes to the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Major changes include the regional freeway system completion date being accelerated to 2007, funding for access routes, improvements to the Estrella, the extension of the Agua Fria along 99th Avenue, and changing Grand Avenue into a controlled access facility. Transit changes incorporated a fixed guideway element, and updated express bus and fixed route plans. A new section will be added to address management, operations and safety.

Ken Driggs added that RPTA will be meeting with the southwest valley to discuss rail alternatives.

DD Barker was recognized by the chair, and provided some written comments to Ken Driggs as discussed at the CTOC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.